

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Scott William Faul,
Petitioner,
v.

**ORDER ADOPTING
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Michel Lejeune, Warden,
Respondent,

Civil No. 22-02993 (MJD/JFD)

and

Scott William Faul,
Petitioner,
v.

Civil No. 23-01337 (MJD/JFD)

Mark W. King, Warden,
Respondent.

Scott William Faul, Petitioner, pro se.

Adam J. Hoskins, DOJ-Assistant United States Attorney, Ana H. Voss, Assistant United States Attorney, for Respondent.

The above-entitled matter comes before the Court upon the March 25, 2024 Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of United States Magistrate Judge John F. Docherty. (Doc. 21 in Civil No. 22-02993; Doc. 25 in Civil No. 23-01337.)

Petitioner filed objections to the R&R. (Doc. 26 in Civil No. 22-02993; Doc. 28 in Civil No. 23-01337.) Pursuant to statute, the Court has conducted a de novo

review upon the record. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule 72.2(b). Based upon that review, the Court will adopt the Report and Recommendation.

Petitioner's objections fall largely into three categories: (1) baseless statements that insult the judiciary and the Magistrate Judge, in particular; (2) objections to the R&R's findings, analyses, and conclusions that the Court has considered and finds to be without merit; and (3) arguments related to Petitioner's request for an evidentiary hearing. The Court denies Petitioner's request for an evidentiary hearing because the record conclusively demonstrates that he is not entitled to relief. Udoh v. Knutson, No. CV 19-1311 (MJD/HB), 2019 WL 4073392, at *3 (D. Minn. Aug. 29, 2019) (citing White v. Dingle, 757 F.3d 750, 757 (8th Cir. 2014); Crawford v. Norris, 363 F. App'x 428, 430 (8th Cir. 2010); Kendrick v. Carlson, 995 F.2d 1440, 1446 (8th Cir. 1993)).

Accordingly, based upon all files, records, and proceedings herein, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

1. The Court **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge John F. Docherty dated March 25, 2024. **[Doc. 21 in Civil No. 22-02993; Doc. 25 in Civil No. 23-01337];**

2. Petitioner's Petitions for Habeas Corpus [**Doc. 1 in Civil No. 22-02993; Doc. 1 in Civil No. 23-01337**] are **DENIED**; and
3. Petitioner's Motions for a Temporary Restraining Order [**Doc. 17 in Civil No. 22-02993; Doc. 19 in Civil No. 23-01337**] are **DENIED as moot.**

LET JUDGEMENT BE ENTERED ACCORDINGLY.

Dated: June 4, 2024

s/Michael J. Davis

Michael J. Davis

United States District Court